

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

APTIV TECHNOLOGIES AG,)	
)	
Plaintiff and Counter Defendant,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 23-307-JDW
)	
MICROCHIP TECHNOLOGY INC.,)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
)	
Defendant and Counter Plaintiff.)	

**PLAINTIFF APTIV TECHNOLOGIES AG’S ANSWER TO MICROCHIP
TECHNOLOGY, INC.’S COUNTERCLAIMS TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Aptiv Technologies AG (“Aptiv”) hereby submits its Answer to Microchip Technology Inc.’s (“Microchip”) Counterclaims to Aptiv’s Second Amended Complaint (D.I. 100). Unless specifically admitted, Aptiv denies each and every allegation made by Microchip in its Counterclaims. For ease of reference, Aptiv refers to Microchip’s headings and titles, but to the extent those headings and titles could be construed to contain factual allegations, those allegations are denied.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Aptiv admits that Microchip brings counterclaims for judgment of non-infringement and invalidity of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,619,420 (the “’420 Patent”); 9,645,962 (the “’962 Patent”); 9,460,037 (the “’037 Patent”); 10,545,899 (the “’899 Patent”); 11,176,072 (the “’072 Patent”); and 11,681,643 (the “’643 Patent”) (collectively, the “Aptiv Patents”).

THE PARTIES

2. Aptiv admits that Microchip Technology Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a place of business located at 2355 West Chandler Blvd., Chandler, Arizona 85224-6199.

3. Aptiv admits the allegations of Paragraph 3.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. The allegations of Paragraph 4 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

5. The allegations of Paragraph 5 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

6. The allegations of Paragraph 6 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

7. Aptiv admits that it filed the Complaint (D.I. 1) in this action on March 20, 2023, the Amended Complaint (D.I. 42) on June 23, 2023, and the Second Amended Complaint (D.I. 100) on November 8, 2023. Aptiv further admits that each of the Asserted Patents claim priority to the Provisional Application No. 61/882,915, filed September 26, 2013, and that the Dual Role Hub is an embodiment of the Asserted Patents. Otherwise, the Complaint, Amended Complaint, and Second Amended Complaint speak for themselves and Aptiv denies all other allegations in Paragraph 7.

8. Aptiv admits the allegations of Paragraph 8.

9. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 9.

FIRST COUNTERCLAIM

**(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,619,420**

10. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 9 above as though fully set forth herein.

11. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '420 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 11 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

12. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 12.

13. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 13.

14. Paragraph 14 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

SECOND COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,619,420

15. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 14 above as though fully set forth herein.

16. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '420 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 16 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

17. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 17.

18. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 18.

19. Paragraph 19 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

THIRD COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,645,962

20. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 19 above as though fully set forth herein.

21. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '962 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 21 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

22. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 22.

23. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 23.

24. Paragraph 24 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

FOURTH COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)

U.S. Patent No. 9,645,962

25. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 24 above as though fully set forth herein.

26. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '962 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 26 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

27. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 27.

28. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 28.

29. Paragraph 29 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

FIFTH COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,460,037

30. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 29 above as though fully set forth herein.

31. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '037 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 31 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

32. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 32.

33. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 33.

34. Paragraph 34 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

SIXTH COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,460,037

35. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 34 above as though fully set forth herein.

36. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '037 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 36 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

37. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 37.

38. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 38.

39. Paragraph 39 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

SEVENTH COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,545,899

40. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 39 above as though fully set forth herein.

41. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '899 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 41 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

42. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 42.

43. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 43.

44. Paragraph 44 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

EIGHTH COUNTERCLAIM

**(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,545,899**

45. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 44 above as though fully set forth herein.

46. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '899 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 46 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

47. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 47.

48. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 48.

49. Paragraph 49 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

NINTH COUNTERCLAIM

**(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)
U.S. PATENT NO. 11,176,072**

50. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 49 above as though fully set forth herein.

51. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '072 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 51 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

52. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 52.

53. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 53.

54. Paragraph 54 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

TENTH COUNTERCLAIM

**(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)
U.S. PATENT NO. 11,176,072**

55. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 54 above as though fully set forth herein.

56. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '072 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 56 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

57. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 57.

58. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 58.

59. Paragraph 59 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

ELEVENTH COUNTERCLAIM

**(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT)
U.S. PATENT NO. 11,681,643**

60. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 59 above as though fully set forth herein.

61. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes the '643 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 61 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

62. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 62.

63. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 63.

64. Paragraph 64 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

TWELFTH COUNTERCLAIM

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)

U.S. PATENT NO. 11,681,643

65. Aptiv repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 64 above as though fully set forth herein.

66. Aptiv admits that it alleges that Microchip infringes at least one valid claim of the '643 Patent. The remaining allegations of Paragraph 66 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

67. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 67.

68. Aptiv denies the allegations of Paragraph 68.

69. Paragraph 69 consists only of Microchip's request for a declaration and includes no allegations, and thus requires no response.

MICROCHIP'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Microchip's Answer and Counterclaims recites a prayer for relief to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Aptiv denies that Microchip is entitled to any relief whatsoever in this action, either as requested in its Answer and Counterclaims or otherwise.

GENERAL DENIAL

Except as specifically admitted herein, Aptiv denies the remaining allegations in Microchip's Answer and Counterclaims.

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

OF COUNSEL:

Daralyn J. Durie
Timothy Saulsbury
Eric C. Wiener
Andrew L. Perito
Joyce C. Li
Tannyr Pasvantis
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 268-7000

Andrew T. Jones
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2100 L St., NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C., 20037
(202) 887-1500

W. Henry Huttinger
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 892-5200

Dated: December 13, 2023
11209297

By: /s/ Philip A. Rovner
Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Jonathan A. Choa (#5319)
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com
jchoa@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Aptiv Technologies AG